Application No. 10/765,152 Reply to Election of Species Requirement of March 25, 2005

Applicants have elected with traverse, Species (a): Claim 12. Applicants' election of

species is for examination purposes only. Claims 10-12, and 15-24 read on the elected

species.

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the species, but

note that for restriction to be proper, there must be a patentable difference between the

species as claimed (M.P.E.P. § 808.01(a)). The Office has not provided any reasons or

examples to support a conclusion that the species are patentably distinct. The Office has

merely stated a conclusion. Accordingly, Applicants submit the Election of Species

Requirement is improper. Applicants request withdrawal of the Election of Species

Requirement.

With respect to the elected species, Applicants submit that, should the elected species

be found allowable, the Office should expand its search to the non-elected species.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not shown that a serious

burden exists in searching the entire application.

Applicants submit this application is now in condition for examination on the merits.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/03)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Daniel Pereira, Ph.D.

Registration No. 45,518

2